



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/552,138

07/10/2006

Nicolas Prigent

PF030060

7177

24498 7590 04/21/2010

Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations
THOMSON Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

RUBIN, BLAKE J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2457

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/21/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/552,138	Applicant(s) PRIGENT ET AL.	
	Examiner BLAKE RUBIN	Art Unit 2457	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to a request for continued examination filed April 7, 2010.
2. Claims 1 and 3-9 are currently pending. Claim 1 is currently amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1 and 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gehrman (EP 1102430 A1) in view of Stajano et al (The Resurrecting Duckling: Security Issues for Ad-hoc Wireless Networks, hereinafter Stajano).**

5. With respect to claim 1, Gehrman discloses a device adapted to belong to a community of networked devices, said device comprising:

a provable identity and/or means for generating and/or obtaining a provable identity (paragraph 29);

means adapted to store information about devices of the community having trust relationships with said device (paragraph 30);

means adapted to store information about devices not trusted by said device (paragraph 35); and

means for trust relationships synchronization (paragraph 30, and 33-37).

But does not disclose having a trust relationship in the past but now not trusted by said device.

However, Stajano discloses having a trust relationship in the past but now not trusted by said device (page 6, last paragraph, *able to recover from circumstances in which the legitimate user loses the shared secret*).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gehrman with the teachings of Stajano. The motivation to combine being to provide a more dynamic security mechanism for allowing information pertaining to previously trusted devices to remain stored within the system.

6. With respect to claim 3, the combination of Gehrman and Stajano discloses the device according to claim 1, Gehrman further discloses wherein the information about devices comprises the provable identity of said devices (paragraph 29).

7. With respect to claim 4, the combination of Gehrman and Stajano discloses the device according to claim 1, Gehrman further discloses wherein said device is furthermore designed to store information comprising proofs received from other devices of the community that said device is trusted by other devices (paragraph 29).

8. With respect to claim 5, the combination of Gehrman and Stajano discloses the device according to claim 1, Gehrman further discloses wherein said means for trust relationship

Art Unit: 2457

synchronization comprise means to exchange information with other devices of the community about devices trusted and/or not trusted by other devices in the community (See Abstract, paragraph 29).

9. With respect to claim 6 , the combination of Gehrmann and Stajano discloses the device according to claim 1, Gehrmann further discloses wherein said devices comprises:

a first object capable of containing identities of devices trusted (paragraph 0013: holding trust relations)

a second object capable of containing identities of devices trusted by said device (paragraph 0013: holding trust relations); and

a third object capable of containing identities of devices distrusted by said device (paragraph 0035-0036: distrust list).

10. With respect to claim 7, the combination of Gehrmann and Stajano discloses the device according to claim 6, Gehrmann further discloses wherein said device is able to modify the content of said first object and/or said second object and/or said third object as a function of information exchanged with other devices of the community (paragraph 0039: change the node from untrusted to trusted).

11. With respect to claim 8, the combination of Gehrmann and Stajano discloses the device according to claim 6, Gehrmann further discloses wherein said first object and/or said second

Art Unit: 2457

object and/or said third object are furthermore able to contain cryptographic material (paragraph 0040: wherein the nodes contain signed public keys).

12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Gehrman and Stajano in view of Fraser et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0131232).

13. With respect to claim 9, the combination of Gehrman and Stajano discloses the device according to claim 6, but does not disclose that the first device is able to banish another device of said community if the identity of said device to be banished is contained in said first or second object of said first device.

However, Fraser, in an analogous art, discloses that a registration agent of a community may remove a member from the community (Fraser: paragraph 0066).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Gehrman and Stajano with the teachings of Fraser. The motivation to combine being to provide a security mechanism for the community by having the capability to remove a member of the community (Fraser: paragraph 0067).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed April 7, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2457

15. With respect to claim 1, the applicant argues that Stajano storing a password cannot be interpreted to correspond to belonging to the community of network devices.

16. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The “resurrecting duckling” biological analogy of Stajano depicts a situation whereby a household electronic device is a known member of a community at some point in time, while at some later point in time the electronic device is no longer recognized as a trusted member of the community. Staying with the biological analogy, Stajano refers to this situation as reverse metempsychosis (page 6, 3.3, second paragraph), whereby the electronic device can commit suicide, returning to a pre-birth state, thereby no longer considered a trusted member of the electronic community. As far as the applicant objection to the centralized authentication of Stajano, citing section 3.2, the examiner points out that the teaching away of such centralized schemes of Stajano is a result of economic and political constraints, while making it clear that technologically speaking such an authorization system would not only be feasible, but beneficial as well (notwithstanding security or other such issues).

Conclusion

17. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 10/552,138. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**

Art Unit: 2457

even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BLAKE RUBIN whose telephone number is (571) 270-3802. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2457

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

4/15/10

/Rubin Blake/
Examiner, Art Unit 2457

/ARIO ETIENNE/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457